

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

• • • • •

Crim. No. 22-387

TERRANCE GREEN

100

ORDER

AND NOW, this 13th day of December, 2023, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Defendant's *pro se* Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 68) and Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 71) are **DENIED**. On December 5, 2023, I conducted a hearing regarding Defendant's series of recently filed *pro se* motions and request for new counsel. (Doc. No. 72.) At the hearing, Green agreed to proceed with his current counsel. Because he remains represented, he may not file motions *pro se*. Richardson v. Superintendent Coal Twp. SCI, 905 F.3d 750, 757 (3d Cir. 2018) (“Pennsylvania law . . . tells courts not to consider *pro se* pleadings filed by parties who are represented by counsel”); Pagliaccetti v. Kerestes, 948 F. Supp. 2d 452, 457 (E.D. Pa. 2013) (“[T]here is no constitutional right to hybrid representation, and a district court is not obligated to consider *pro se* motions by represented litigants”). If Green wishes to pursue these motions, it must be through counsel.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ *Paul S. Diamond*

Paul S. Diamond, J.